

R E M A R K S

Applicant has carefully considered the above identified Office Action, and in response thereto is addressing each issue raised by the examiner in the remarks hereinbelow. In this regard, applicant is amending 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23 - 27; canceling without prejudice claim 28 and adding claims 29 - 30.

Claim Rejection 35 USC 112

Applicant has amended claims 13 and 21 by replacing the phrase "such that" with the word "wherein." The word "thereof" has been replaced with "said plow blade." The word "may" has been removed. The word "the angled plow assembly" has been replaced with "said plow blade." All claims dependent upon a newly definite base claim are also made definite.

Claim Rejection 35 USC 102(b)

Applicant has amended claim 12 by extending the end blade from a trailing end of the plow blade. The Winter '163 does not disclose an end blade extending from a trailing end of the plow blade. The Winter '163 does disclose a lower edge 530 extending from a bottom of the blade 500, but NOT from a trailing end of the trailing end 500. Examiner must provide a prior art reference that discloses all the limitations or elements of the claim according to the case of Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech Inc., 18 USPQ 2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir.

1991).

Invalidity for anticipation requires that all of the elements and limitations of the claim are found within a single prior art reference. . . . There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed-by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention.

Winter '163 does not disclose an end blade and therefore cannot be used to reject newly amended claim 12.

Applicant has amended claim 21 to make it definite. However, Winter '163 does not disclose a plow blade having symmetry. Figure 3 of Winter '163 shows a blade with an unsymmetric cross section. Examiner must provide a prior art reference that discloses all the limitations or elements. Winter '163 does not disclose a plow blade having symmetry. All claims dependent upon a newly allowable base claim are also allowable.

Interview with examiner

Applicant respectfully requests that examiner take note of the telephone interview that occurred on April 8, 2005. The following topics were discussed during the interview concerning the Office Action:

- 1) Making claims 13 and 21 define.
- 2) Making claims 12 and 21 allowable.

C O N C L U S I O N

It is respectfully submitted that applicant has responded in a fully satisfactory manner to all matters at issue in this application, and this application is now in condition for allowance. In this regard, applicant has made every effort to comply with the requirements set forth in this Office Action as well as statutory requirements. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter this amendment, allow the claims, and pass this application on to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald J. Ersler
Reg No. 38,753

Dated: 4/11/05

Donald J. Ersler
Attorney at Law
725 Garvens Avenue
Brookfield, Wisconsin 53005
Phone: (262) 785-0160
Fax: (262) 785-0162